

Meeting minutes

Kagaru to Acacia Ridge and Bromelton Community Consultative Committee

Date / Time

30 November 2020
6.00-8.00pm

Location

Jimboomba Hall

Chair

Hon Gary Hardgrave (Chair)

Secretariat

Laura Jarman (LJ)

Attendees

- ▶ Suzanne Corbett – Inland Rail Action Group (SC)
- ▶ Angela Harlen – Beaudesert Chamber of Commerce (AH)
- ▶ Stephen Harrison – Flinders Land Holdings Pty Ltd (SHn)
- ▶ David Kenny – Logan Country Safe Group (DK)
- ▶ Ken Madden – Individual (KM)
- ▶ Phil Manitta – St Stephen’s Catholic School (PM)
- ▶ Anne Page – Logan and Albert Conservation Association (AP)
- ▶ Lloyd Stumer – Individual (LS)
- ▶ Cameron Thomas – Scenic Rim Regional Council (CT)
- ▶ Bob Wiley – Individual (BW)

Apologies

- ▶ Mallory Wuthrich – Individual (MW)
- ▶ Chantal Swanton-Gallant – Bolton Clarke Carrington Aged Care Facility (CSG)

ARTC

- ▶ Shane Harris – Principal Environment Advisor (SHs)
- ▶ Karen Hillery – Engagement Advisor – K2ARB (KH)
- ▶ Mark McNamara – Senior Environment Advisor – K2ARB (MM)
- ▶ Rob McNamara – Project Director North Star to Acacia Ridge and Bromelton (RM)
- ▶ Nicola Mitchell – Stakeholder Engagement Operations Manager (NM)
- ▶ Rebecca Pickering – Director Engagement, Environment and Property (RP)
- ▶ Kerrin Roberts – Project Manager – K2ARB (KR)
- ▶ Peter Sturwohld – Design Manager – K2ARB (PS)
- ▶ Bethany Warren – Air Quality specialist (BW)

Discussions

NO.	DISCUSSION
	<p>Safety Share</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ LJ provided a safety share on storm safety <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Be prepared for a storm <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ tidy up loose items like garden furniture and building materials that could become missiles in strong winds ▶ Prune trees that could come down in a storm ▶ replace broken roof tiles, keep gutters clean and fix leaks ▶ check the BOM website for updates

NO.	DISCUSSION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ keep a battery-operated torch and radio handy with spare batteries nearby and some bottled water ▶ During a storm <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ stay away from fallen wires or anything touching them. report any fallen powerlines ▶ unplug sensitive appliances such as computers, video recorders and televisions ▶ don't use a landline telephone during an electrical storm ▶ check your phone, or listen to the radio for weather updates ▶ After a storm <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ watch out for fallen powerlines, particularly those hidden in trees or other storm debris ▶ always assume fallen powerlines are "live", don't approach them ▶ don't attempt to drive across or swim in flooded creeks and drains.
1	<p>Welcome and introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The Chair opened the meeting. ▶ The Chair acknowledged the Traditional Owners. ▶ The Chair thanked members for attending and acknowledged the observers attending the meeting in person and those watching online. ▶ The Chair advised of the safety exits. ▶ The Chair advised of ongoing rules to prevent the spread of COVID: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Social distancing – be mindful of keeping 1.5m from others ▶ Wash your hands frequently ▶ Use hand sanitiser ▶ One microphone between two – please wipe down between uses ▶ Regular cleaning of surfaces. <p>The Chair outlined the protocols for the meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Announce name before speaking for people observing online ▶ Hold questions until end of the presentation ▶ Note agenda is very full so we need to stick to time if we are going to get out of here at a reasonable time. ▶ Wipe down microphone after use. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ KR introduced the K2ARB Project team: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Peter Sturwohld – Design Manager ▶ Nicola Mitchell – Stakeholder Engagement Operations Manager ▶ Laura Jarman – Stakeholder Engagement Lead ▶ Mark McNamara – Senior Environment Advisor ▶ Rob McNamara – Project Director, North Star to Acacia Ridge and Bromelton ▶ Rebecca Pickering – Director Engagement, Environment and Property ▶ Shane Harris – Principal Environment Advisor ▶ Bethany Warren – Air Quality Specialist (ERM) ▶ KR acknowledged a number of other Inland Rail staff were also present. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The Chair requested members declare conflicts of interest. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ <i>No conflicts of interest were disclosed.</i>
2	<p>Update on actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The Chair advised that an update on the actions was shown on screen and most had been completed.

NO.	DISCUSSION
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ARTC to report back to the members regarding progress on the development of a business case regarding a dedicated freight line to the Port of Brisbane. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ NM provided an update from the Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Communications about the Port of Brisbane Business Case, which was still in an early phase and project managers and technical consultants were currently being engaged. 2. Advise how it would affect the Public Private Partnership (PPP) if the K2ARB section were not approved. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ RM advised that the PPP remains commercially viable, irrespective of whether the project goes to Acacia Ridge or not. Freight will be moved from Melbourne to Sydney and other destinations, so ending at Acacia Ridge or somewhere else makes no commercial difference to the viability of the PPP. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ LS noted that there's a lot of information indicating that if coal is not transported on Inland Rail, that the train line won't be viable. This would then impact the PPP's viability. ▶ RM responded that the PPP consortium is guaranteed to get paid. Irrespective of whether coal is transported on the line or not, the PPP still remains viable. Now that Inland Rail has commenced construction, the program is starting to see a lot of interest and opportunities that weren't there previously, right across the alignment, including non-coal interest.
3	<p>Project update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ KR provided a K2ARB project overview and update: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Inland Rail aims to provide the spine of a freight rail network from Melbourne to Brisbane, achieving a journey time of less than 24 hours, 98 per cent reliability and at pricing competitive with road freight. More details on the proposed service offering are available in ARTC's business case, located on the Inland Rail website. ▶ Kagaru to Acacia Ridge and Bromelton is one of 13 projects that make up the proposed Inland Rail alignment from Melbourne to Brisbane. It proposes to utilise the existing Interstate rail corridor as directed by the Queensland Government in 2016. ▶ K2ARB is classified as a rail enhancement project, meaning works undertaken are to allow 1,800m double-stacked freight trains to travel along the alignment. The proposed scope is to lower the track at five existing road over rail bridge sites, to allow clearance for double-stacked trains, two new crossing loops and extensions to two existing crossing loops, with a new connection to the existing intermodal terminal at Bromelton. ▶ The project aims to retain all of the permanent enhancement works within the existing rail corridor and therefore does not anticipate any private property acquisitions. ▶ The remainder of the proposed Inland Rail route to Melbourne will connect to the existing interstate route at Kagaru. ▶ The Kagaru to Acacia Ridge and Bromelton project is currently in 'phase 2' of the project life cycle, producing a reference design, conducting environmental investigations and producing primary approvals documentation during this phase. ▶ The current project timeline includes a construction start in 2023, following project approval and production of detailed design. ▶ ARTC has completed the full range of engineering surveys and assessments required to produce a reference design for the proposed enhancement works. The reference design has been finalised through the project's technical consultants, Hatch, to confirm that the proposed enhancement works within the rail corridor are feasible from an engineering and construction perspective.

NO.	DISCUSSION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Environmental studies including the baseline noise and vibration modelling have been completed, with 12 months of baseline air quality data compiled. ▶ Operational noise, vibration and air quality modelling activities have also been completed. ▶ ARTC has completed engagement to inform the production of a Social Impact Assessment has been completed, due for completion in early 2021. ▶ ARTC is in the process of finalising the draft Primary Approvals documentation, based on the output of these investigations. The findings will be shared in the meeting tonight. ▶ Loop locations due diligence <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The preliminary studies on due diligence on the location of the Larapinta Loop (near Forestdale) have been completed and are undergoing a final round of modelling and assessment. It is hoped to have an answer for the community on this in early 2021, which is slightly later than what was previously communicated. This is to ensure the assessment process is robust, prior to confirming the outcome. ▶ The project's community consultation program has continued throughout the last few months and focused largely and government agency consultation and finalising the Social Impact Assessment workshops. Tonight's meeting is the start of key next steps in the engagement process, to communicate information on anticipated impacts and proposed mitigations.
4	<p>Update on environmental and technical investigations</p> <p>Constructability, traffic impact assessment and flooding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ PS provided an update on some of the engineering work that has been progressed. ▶ The construction period is from 2023 to 2025. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The individual location construction durations were outlined, which ranged from 16 to 26 weeks depending on the site, with an extended possession duration from 36 to 60 hours per site. ▶ Extended track possessions are required for track lowering and the installation of main line turn-outs, at crossing loops. ▶ Weekdays and daytime works will occur for all pre-extended possession and non-possession activities. Night time works will occur only during extended possession times. ▶ Confirmed all permanent works can be accommodated within the existing rail corridor boundary. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ There are some temporary requirements for outside of the corridor, including laydown areas, stockpiles and corridor access. ▶ Individual property owners have been engaged where potential temporary works have been identified. ▶ The turnout installation process was outlined. ▶ An update regarding the SCT branch line and level crossings was provided. ▶ Visualisations/artist's impressions of how the enhancement works areas may look after construction were shown. ▶ Haulage routes were outlined, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ From Bromelton Quarry to the track lowering and crossing loop sites ▶ From the track lowering sites to Remondis and Humes (potential waste disposal and supplier sites) ▶ From Remondis and Humes to the crossing loop sites ▶ These will be confirmed with the transport authorities prior to construction. ▶ An overview of construction traffic was provided. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Construction works and associated road traffic will not impact significantly on the road network. ▶ Construction traffic volumes will be low, ranging from 20 to 36 vehicles per hour, for periods ranging from 8 to 36 weeks.

NO.	DISCUSSION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ No permanent mitigation measures will be required. ▶ Disruptions will be temporary, occurring over a matter of weeks. ▶ Construction traffic volumes will be highest during the extended possession windows of 36 or 60 hours, which will be scheduled to fall outside of weekday morning and afternoon traffic peak periods. ▶ Vehicle movements during pre and post possession works will be scheduled to fall outside of the weekday morning and afternoon traffic peak periods relatively easily. <p>▶ Mitigations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Appropriate traffic management plans will be prepared by a registered traffic management designer for each site, prior to construction. ▶ Site traffic control by qualified traffic controllers will be implemented. ▶ Appropriate maintenance plans for the rehabilitation of road pavement conditions after construction will be prepared and implemented. ▶ Heavy vehicle movements during extended and post possession windows will be scheduled to fall outside of morning and afternoon peak period traffic. <p>▶ Hydrology overview:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Upgrade of existing track, including extension of culverts and minor changes to existing hydrology systems ▶ Project modelled before and after proposed project works to understand potential impacts ▶ Results show minor changes to the flood level (afflux) outside of rail corridor ▶ Afflux is localised around existing drainage structures and flow paths ▶ The project has identified further survey is required around Teviot Road/Stoney Camp Road due to the complexity of the drainage system ▶ Consultation with potentially affected parties has commenced. <p><i>Questions and discussion</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The Chair remarked that he thought the Teviot Road area would require some further work, given the amount of water going into the Logan River and the downstream flooding potential. ▶ SHn asked about the level of afflux that has been created anywhere along the alignment. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ PS noted that some locations had up to half a metre as the worst case afflux, but that was in around a 5 metre by 10 metre area, in a rural location. Most of the afflux is within the railway corridor. ▶ SHn remarked that any development that is undertaken anywhere, needs to ensure there's no adverse impact on any downstream landowners. He said this means anything that's outside the rail corridor needs to be considered, as they aren't allowed to do anything from a millimetre upwards. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ PS agreed with this comment and confirmed that was why they had been undertaking engagement activities. There is an existing system in place, so there's existing drainage for any culverts that are being extended. There are minor impacts to flooding systems. ▶ SHn asked if ARTC can devise a solution that creates no afflux downstream or in any area outside of the rail corridor? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ PS noted that this was not possible during the reference design stage. ▶ DK stated that he was worried about the traffic on roads eg the Mount Lindesay Highway, Bromelton House Road, Brooklands Road and Barnes Road. They are all not coping with traffic at the moment. Scenic Rim Regional Council were going to close these roads to traffic and to use the truck bypass instead. He suggested that more work may need to be done on these roads. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ PS confirmed that Scenic Rim Regional Council has told ARTC not to use these roads, so some routes will need to be revised to ensure they aren't used. ▶ BW asked what the criteria was to choose the roads used in Flagstone, as Teamster Court is a residential area with young children playing in this street.

NO.	DISCUSSION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ PS remarked that this street was identified as site access, rather than haul route access and is a preliminary identification at this stage. ARTC is looking at using an alternative option to the south. ▶ BW asked if residents had been spoken to yet. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ PS said this hadn't occurred yet as ARTC was still receiving feedback, such as what is being provided now. ▶ AP queried what roads would be used to access the Mount Lindesay Highway from the works occurring at Middle Road, Greenbank. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ PS stated that ARTC would use Sheppards Drive and then over the Middle Road bridge as the mail haul route. From there, it would depend on where ARTC was travelling to eg south down to the quarry, or north and then west. This information will be passed onto ARTC's contractor, including any areas not to be used. It will be up to the contractor to identify the plan that is both economical and has the least impacts on the community. ▶ AP asked about Brooklands Road in the Scenic Rim, which is a narrow road, and how two B-double trucks or a semi-trailer carrying chickens could pass each other there. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ PS remarked that this type of information goes into traffic management plans. ARTC's traffic impact assessment identifies these issues, which are then reflected in the traffic management plan eg a certain road can't be used due to safety issues. ▶ AP noted that construction traffic ranged from between 20 to 36 vehicles per hour, which could be more than two or three an hour, and asked what the size of the vehicles were. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ PS said it was assumed to be a 'truck and a dog' ie a body truck/tipper, with a trailer behind. ▶ AP remarked that some local roads off Mount Lindesay Highway are rural roads and are not designed for heavy vehicles. There was a truck and car incident at Crowson Lane, where a truck overturned, as well as other incidents in recent times involving truck movements. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ PS confirmed that ARTC needs to minimise and mitigate these, which is why the traffic management plans are developed. Crash history in areas is also investigated and avoided or traffic volumes are reduced etc. ▶ AP asked about school peak-hour times and school bus routes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ PS confirmed that ARTC was seeking to avoid the morning and afternoon school peaks. This feedback has also been provided by local councils and other stakeholders. ▶ LS queried Local Government versus State Government responsibilities and approvals regarding constructability and traffic management. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ PS confirmed that this wasn't his area of expertise, however Local Government approve local roads. State-controlled roads would be approved by the Department of Transport and Main Roads (TMR). TMR have reviewed ARTC's traffic impact assessment documentation. ▶ LS asked who is responsible for the construction approvals. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ PS summarised the query as whether someone is looking at coordinating the cumulative impacts. ARTC is engaging with local authorities regarding the project, who are aware of other projects occurring. They will advise ARTC of anything to avoid or extra mitigation that may be needed. ARTC are actively engaging with government authorities and incorporating their feedback into the relevant documentation as that will form part of the approvals later. ▶ The Chair summarised that traffic and flooding is a vulnerable area under a lot of pressure due to other projects, and there will likely be a lot more work done in these areas as the project progresses. <p>Noise and vibration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The Chair requested SHs to try to cut some of the technical parts of the information presented and to get to the crux of the matter where possible. ▶ SHs presented an update on noise and vibration studies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ An overview of noise was provided, including airborne noise and the existing noise environment.

NO.	DISCUSSION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Monitoring sites were selected that were close to the enhancement work areas. ▶ A summary of the monitoring results is as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Beaudesert Road and Learoyd Road Bridge enhancement work area: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Urban environment. ▶ Background noise levels ranged between 38-42 dBA in the day, 33-43 dBA in the evening and 28-37 dBA in the night time. Background noise levels were influenced by proximity to major roads. ▶ No vibration peaks above 0.25mm/s were found to correspond with train movements past logging locations. ▶ Johnson Road Bridge, Larapinta Loop (near Forestdale), Middle Road/Greenbank loop and Kagaru loop enhancement work areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Suburban environment. ▶ Background noise levels ranged between 33-46 dBA in the day, 29-44 dBA in the evening and 24-33 dBA in the night time. Background noise levels were influenced by environmental sources. ▶ Hillcrest was the only monitoring location recording more significant vibration levels which correlated with train pass-bys. ▶ Bromelton loop enhancement work area: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Rural environment. ▶ Background noise levels ranged between 28-30 dBA in the day, 25-28 dBA in the evening and 23 dBA in the night time. Background noise levels were influenced by environmental sources eg insects. ▶ Vibration monitoring was not undertaken as receptors are set back approximately 600 metres from the railway corridor. ▶ The Queensland Department of Transport and Main Roads has set specific noise and vibration goals for construction. The guideline stipulates standard and non-standard hours for construction activities. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Earthworks and rail civil works have been identified as the highest potential for construction noise impacts. ▶ Significant vibration impacts are not expected. ▶ Peak construction traffic of 20 to 36 vehicles per hour may generate noise levels of 60-65 dBA. ▶ Potential levels and impacts will be short term at each enhancement site. ▶ Mitigation measures will be implemented, including non-tonal reverse alarms and alternate work practices. ▶ Management measures will be applied, including respite periods, appropriately sized equipment and a notification process. ▶ ARTC's noise management levels for operational railway noise includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Triggers adopted with reference to standards and policies in Australia for railway noise management ▶ More stringent than typical Queensland environmental goals ▶ Aim to improve community outcomes ▶ Consistent across Inland Rail Projects ▶ Considers the night time period—which is more sensitive. ▶ Preliminary outcomes in project work areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ 157 sensitive receivers were identified as potentially being triggered at commencement, with an additional 51 receivers potentially triggered in 2040 (design year). ▶ Five non-residential receivers were identified as potentially being triggered. ▶ Learoyd Road: up to 11 triggers ▶ Johnson Road/Larapinta loop (near Forestdale): up to 143 sensitive receivers triggered ▶ Pub Lane/Middle Road: up to 25 sensitive receivers triggered

NO.	DISCUSSION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ An outline on vibration types was provided. ▶ A mitigation overview was provided, including source reduction, noise transmission and at-property treatments. ▶ The noise mitigation strategy is based on a <i>reasonable and practicable</i> approach (DTMR, 2019). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ At-property options will also be considered where necessary. <p><i>Questions and discussion</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ SHn commented that the information presented was for existing houses and queried information about houses that haven't been built yet. Some of the major developments have been conditioned to provide a minimum average density of 15 dwellings to a hectare, some of which are within metres of the train line. ▶ SHs remarked that ARTC has looked at the project construction areas. The next phase of works currently being undertaken is reviewing the broader route outside of the project construction areas, including future development sites. This includes how far the noise may extend and whether barriers may need to be considered. ▶ AP noted she had concerns about the potential impacts regarding noise, and that Inland Rail had a duty of care to be looking at the cumulative impacts regarding noise levels from ARTC freight, as well as the future passenger rail which was intended for the corridor. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ SHs advised that ARTC knows the existing train movements and the future train planning, and can provide an accurate and reliable assessment utilising this information. There are a range of things that can occur in the future, including other projects or other roads. When there's some surety about these things, they will be assessed, possibly not by ARTC but by others. ▶ AP remarked that ARTC was aware that the passenger rail is intended for this corridor. It is part of the South-East Queensland regional plan and the Federal Government Environment EPBC Act is concerned about cumulative impacts from projects. For ecological sustainable development, ARTC knows it is a known impact with a cumulative impact and has a responsibility to be considering this to provide certainty for the environment and current and future residents. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ SHs confirmed that ARTC is considering cumulative impacts for the Kagaru to Acacia Ridge and Bromelton project based on known existing projects that are viable and are reasonably expected. The existing movements, the 2025 movements and the 2040 movements are all taken into account. There's no business case for passenger rail ARTC is aware of that can provide suitable design, the number of movements or type of movements. ARTC can't assess a potential for expansion to a corridor, whether passenger or other freight, when required information is not known. ▶ AP said that the community expected better and that it's unacceptable. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ KR noted that the Salisbury to Beaudesert (S2B) passenger rail service is currently only at business case stage and isn't due to be delivered for another two years. As such, it's not an approved project and the information is not available for ARTC to assess. ▶ AP said that in all of the planning documents it is a corridor that is being reserved for passenger rail. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ KR agreed that it is being reserved, but whether the project goes ahead will be based on an approved business case, which hasn't been completed yet. ▶ SHs said that ARTC is currently assessing accurate information that can be relied upon. If S2B comes along in two years, then it will be assessed, as well as Inland Rail's impacts, and the total level of impact. ▶ The Chair queried whether an asterisk could be included in the report which includes a 'guesstimate' about what the additional passenger rail movements may be and the types of trains used, to indicate that there may be an additional range of noise impacts that may come in time. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ SHs replied that ARTC has specifically taken a conservative approach, to try and minimise their impact levels ie ARTC are working to criteria that are stringent than current Queensland environmental railway noise criteria, to try to limit community impacts and to minimise ARTC's

NO.	DISCUSSION
	<p>footprint. Any future projects would need to consider the work that ARTC has done. ARTC's mitigation activities, such as noise barriers or property treatments are there for all projects creating noise impacts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ AP asked if the S2B passenger rail was fast-tracked and the business case was available, and ARTC hasn't delivered the rail yet, what ARTC's position would be regarding reviewing their modelling. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ SHs said S2B numbers would be considered if they were at reference design stage now, however, they are not at that stage. If S2B catches up with Inland Rail, then the numbers would be factored in, however, this is unlikely to occur. ▶ LS asked if it was possible to obtain a copy of the report ARTC referred to in its presentation and whether the number of houses needing property treatments (eg glazing) occurred at 50m or 500m of the rail line, as the southern rail corridor noise studies suggested. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ SHs remarked that ARTC was at a more advanced stage than the Southern Sydney Freight rail corridor and had more information to utilise in their planning. ▶ SHs added that the report was only in draft. ▶ The Chair said that the request for the report had been noted. He also noted that tonight's presentation would be circulated to CCC members (see actions). <p>Air quality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ BW presented an update on air quality studies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The project's air quality monitoring program included the following activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ A baseline air quality monitoring campaign, over a 12 month period. ▶ Dust deposition monitoring ▶ Diesel particulate monitoring ▶ Construction dust assessment ▶ Operational odour assessment ▶ Operational air quality monitoring assessment. ▶ Construction air quality assessment includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Risk assessment methodology adopted from the UK Institute of Air Quality Management (UK IAQM) Guidance on the Assessment of Dust from Demolition and Construction ▶ Conservative assumptions were made around the scale of construction activities ▶ Proposed mitigation methods to be applied during pre-construction and construction phases. ▶ Operational air quality assessment includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Emission estimation ▶ Meteorological modelling ▶ Dispersion modelling ▶ Assessment of cumulative impacts. ▶ ARTC utilised the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Queensland DES guideline: Application Requirements for Activities with Impacts to Air ▶ New South Wales EPA for the Modelling and Assessment of Air Pollutants in NSW ▶ BCC Air Quality Planning Scheme ▶ CALPUFF dispersion model. ▶ Preliminary modelling indicates that, without control in place, coal dust emissions contributed to over 95 per cent of PM₁₀ limits. With mitigation, the modelled mitigation measures are within the Queensland State guidelines. ▶ With best practice measures, coal dust emissions can be reduced by 75 to 93 per cent. ▶ Metal deposition – rainwater tank quality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Assessment of rainwater tank quality estimate based on the annual deposited material dissolved in the maximum amount of annual rainfall ▶ Results are significantly lower than the Australian Drinking Water Guidelines

NO.	DISCUSSION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The risk to drinking water quality from the proposed operation of K2ARB is predicted to be very low ▶ The majority of sensitive receptors adjacent to the rail corridor have reticulated water supplies, which lowers the risk to health. ▶ Mitigation methods for construction and operations will be implemented, in line with best practice. This includes the development of a site-specific Construction Environment Management Plan. <p><i>Questions and discussion</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ PM advised he was concerned that the baseline numbers used were four trains per day, which will increase 10-fold by the end of the project. He also asked who is responsible for coal dust. To say there is no impact on the air quality is false. ARTC has said in tonight's meeting that they can't use what might happen in the future for noise, yet for air quality, they have said that the diesel engines are going to change in future. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ BW remarked that the background air quality doesn't just consider the existing trains that pass, but also considers all local industry, transportation and emissions from people's houses, as well as natural sources eg dust storms and bushfires. The change is from all of the air quality sources that exist in the area, not the increase from four trains to the new train numbers. ARTC's modelling and health quality criteria are all on an average basis, which is based on health impact studies. ▶ PM asked who takes responsibility for the coal dust. The biggest issue is the pollution from the diesel from these trains. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ BW said that the diesel engine technology used in the forecasting is engines that were implemented in the United States in the 1990s. Any future engine will have this air quality standard, as this is where manufacturing is headed. ▶ SHs advised that any operators using the ARTC network need to do so in accordance with set management plans eg the south west supply chain has a coal dust management plan, which will continue. There will be specific requirements in place as part of the access arrangements with operators. ▶ PM noted that ARTC had previously said that they provide the train and were not responsible for the freight. There would be a contractual arrangement that says they must comply with certain legislation, that was enforced at a contractual level between ARTC and the people seeking track access. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ SHs said that that was correct. If operators don't comply with requirements, they will need to rectify. ▶ SC asked if there was a set standard of diesel engines required in Australia. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ BW said that there wasn't at a federal level. ▶ SC remarked she had heard that old engines were being brought up and painted and putting them on the tracks. She sees and smells the diesel fumes coming off the five trains a day at the moment and with 45 trains a day planned, which is a train almost every 30 minutes, generating diesel fumes and coal dust, there's no set standard. If ARTC is responsible for the train standards and for what happens on the track, can they insist on new diesel engines? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ BW said that is not within ARTC's legal rights. ▶ SHs added that ARTC will have specific requirements for impacts outside of the corridor. There are air quality limits regarding this, which ARTC will need to comply with. ▶ SC remarked that there were currently breaches. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ SHs said that ARTC had undertaken detailed baseline monitoring to look at this, which is more than any other Inland Rail project. If there is an issue with operating trains in the future, or if there's a current issue, this needs to be investigated further. There is legislation to protect community members.

NO.	DISCUSSION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The Chair noted that based on past experience, if there's a deficiency in the legislative rules, ARTC can't contractually enforce that. However, the legislation won't be amended tonight. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ BW added that the government are considering standards regarding rail diesel engines.
5	<p>Communication and engagement update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ LJ provided a communication and engagement update: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Engagement activities undertaken from August – November 2020 included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ August online CCC meeting ▶ Social Impact Assessment (SIA) workshop ▶ a project e-news ▶ key stakeholder meetings ▶ property owner meetings ▶ CCC membership renewal ▶ noise consultation and ▶ project newsletter. ▶ Upcoming engagement activities include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ community information sessions ▶ key stakeholder meetings ▶ property owner meetings ▶ noise consultation ▶ e-news ▶ CCC meeting in early 2021 ▶ Community information sessions are being held at a range of dates and times along the alignment until mid-December. ▶ Inland Rail is carrying out business workshops December in various locations across project areas across November and December through the Inland Rail Skills Academy, to inform and educate local and Indigenous businesses interested in supplying to Inland Rail and other major projects. ▶ Current project opportunities were outlined, including the types of services, materials and equipment that will be required across Inland Rail Projects. Whilst all won't be required for the Kagaru to Acacia Ridge and Bromelton project, there are project businesses who are already supplying other Inland Rail Projects, and other businesses who may be interested in upcoming Project opportunities. ▶ An update was provided regarding the Inland Rail Skills Academy STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Maths) program. This involved a partnership with the University of Newcastle via recently supporting the Brisbane South Science and Engineering Challenge, including Park Ridge school students. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Other STEM initiatives under development include virtual workshops profiling rail careers to high school students, building online educational resources and providing scholarships to the University of Southern Queensland. ▶ LJ provided an update on the CCC membership renewal process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Nominations closed on 13 November 2020. ▶ A number of members of current committee renominated ▶ Nominations are being assessed by an independent assessor ▶ Hope to verbally notify successful applicants by the end of the year and issue letters next year. ▶ She thanked the outgoing committee for their input, which had been greatly appreciated.
6	<p>General business and questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The Chair opened the session to general business from the CCC members.

NO.	DISCUSSION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ LS asked BW how accurate the models used are. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ BW said that they were generally considered to be within 40 per cent accuracy, which can increase. It depends on the receptor location, the refinement of the emissions and the substance being measured. 40 per cent was the worst case. ▶ LS asked what the two main air quality problems in Brisbane were at the moment. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ BW responded they were bush fires and dust storms. ▶ LS clarified that the questions was regarding pollutants. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ BW said they were PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀. ▶ LS disagreed with this and mentioned problems with ozone also. <p>The Chair asked LS if he had any questions in relation to the Inland Rail Kagaru to Acacia Ridge and Bromelton project and advised LS to write a submission or put a note in writing which he would take on notice.</p> ▶ BW asked if any consideration had been given to the local wildlife, especially around Flagstone and surrounding areas once the noise barriers were installed. At the moment the wildlife have access to the rail line, so would there be any spaces they can use for future access. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ MM advised that ARTC was currently undertaking ecological assessments, as well as barrier locations. This work will be progressed through the detailed design phase. <p>ACTION: SHn raised a request for ARTC to provide ongoing updates on investigations, particularly regarding hydrology and afflux.</p> <p>ACTION: SHn requested more information regarding the PPP remaining viable irrespective of coal transport. If coal was removed, he thought there was a lot less concern about Inland Rail's cumulative impact.</p> ▶ The Chair opened the session to questions from observers. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ An observer stated that she lived in New Beith, where there were currently about five trains per day. She raised concerns about the predicted to increase to 65 trains, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, every half hour and will be double-stacked. The noise is currently quite loud and windows rattle at her house, which is nearly one kilometre away. She is concerned about the rest of the residents in the area also and queried the 11,000 residents that ARTC stated would be affected by Inland Rail and wanted to know how this was determined. She also asked why the Queensland or Federal Governments weren't looking into restrictions for the rail line. She is worried about lifestyle impacts and the ability to sleep. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ SHs agreed it is a very important issue and clarified the train movements based on ARTC's planning for 2040 were 40 to 41, which is still a lot of trains. ▶ The observer said the figures were on the website. She queried who was getting paid for this eventually. She raised the storm safety share was a waste of time. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The Chair noted that the safety share was a community responsibility which was over with quickly. ▶ SHs said the number of houses is 26,000 for the whole route, which is two kilometres from the alignment on each side. ▶ The observer raised that the World Health Organisation had restrictions on noise and air and vibrational levels and asked if ARTC took this into account with their studies. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ SHs said that ARTC considered a range of sources. ▶ The observer asked if the computer calculation models had been run, to determine what the noise, air and vibration levels were going to be. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ SHs confirmed that this has been done. Within the project work areas there are 208 houses that trigger a requirement for further investigation. ▶ The observer queried this number.

NO.	DISCUSSION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ The Chair responded that the observer should have a direct conversation about her circumstances at the upcoming ARTC community engagement sessions. ▶ An observer had a question for RM regarding why Ebenezer hadn't been mentioned in the meeting tonight, as a logistics terminal was in plan at Ebenezer, as was previously reported by the State and Federal governments. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ RM noted that ARTC doesn't operate terminals, so the market determines where the terminal locations are. The Government is looking at Ebenezer, as are SCT and ARTC. It is ultimately up to a proponent where they are located. There will be a number of them along the whole alignment ie 1700 kilometres. The Federal Government has allocated \$44m for various projects along the alignment, including looking at a terminal at Goondiwindi and two at Toowoomba. ▶ The Chair remarked that he believed s there were five or six freight hubs planned between Acacia Ridge and the Queensland border, which the market may or may not take up. ▶ A local councillor observing the meeting wondered how all of the 3.6 kilometre, double-stacked trains will be loaded and unloaded in a timely manner. She lives close to the track in New Beith and said it isn't reasonable for people to have the freight trains coming through with the potential for passenger rail as well. She didn't understand why the three levels of government weren't working together on this project. ARTC is having all of the local councils signing different confidentiality agreements, so no-one knew what is occurring. ▶ The councillor advised she understood that the Loganlea train station was being moved 200 metres. ▶ The councillor said that Bromelton was standard gauged, not dual-gauged so she didn't see the point of it. She noted that ARTC own 20,000 hectares in Bromelton and queried why ARTC aren't putting more intermodal terminals there. SCT is there now which is on standard gauge. ▶ The councillor queried why the freight going to the Port of Brisbane isn't going to Gladstone, where there's a deep-water port. She said there's no direct link from Acacia Ridge to the Port of Brisbane. ▶ The councillor stated she wanted more empathy shown by ARTC to the residents living along the line. She wants ARTC to work with all levels of government and to deliver both passenger and freight projects at the same time, so the State Government doesn't have to try to implement passenger rail years later. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ KR responded by saying that Acacia Ridge is the approved terminal for ARTC's current business case. 1,800 metre trains can fit in there. ARTC is delivering a freight rail program and have no information regarding Loganlea station, as that would need to be raised with the State Government. ▶ KR advised that ARTC was not undertaking any agreements with councils that are not for public knowledge. The commercial details within an agreements remain confidential, however the purpose of any agreements largely relate to works impacting the council eg where ARTC are affecting their assets during construction or asset remediation. ▶ KR noted that the current approved business case requires ARTC to go to Bromelton. There are ARTC land holdings there. ARTC currently don't have plans to develop these. The dual-gauge network to Bromelton is existing. It is not commissioned, but the railway has sleepers for a dual-gauge track, should there be a requirement to take narrow-gauge trains to Bromelton. ▶ KR responded that the Committee is not in a position to change the alignment. ARTC are delivering a business case on behalf of the Federal Government, which does not currently go to Gladstone. ▶ KR noted that in terms of State, Federal and Local governments working together, ARTC do work with those parties, and work jointly as best as they can. ▶ The councillor asked what work ARTC had done with Ipswich City Council.

NO.	DISCUSSION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ KR advised that adjacent projects will be working with Ipswich City Council and are in contact with them. ▶ The councillor remarked that she was sure SCT would welcome dual-gauge track there. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ KR agreed and said that ARTC frequently spoke to SCT about the proposed connection and future plans for a terminal there. ▶ The councillor asked what the project timeframe was. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ KR said ARTC was currently proposing to make that connection and commissioning in line with the rest of the Inland Rail Program. The dates given tonight are construction from 2023 to 2025. ▶ The councillor asked what ARTC was doing with the land owned at Bromelton. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ KR confirmed that ARTC don't have any proposals for that land at the moment. ARTC may choose to develop this as and when they are ready. ▶ The Chair congratulated the councillor on their election. He remarked that the Queensland/New South Wales border through to Acacia Ridge is a railway track that's owned by the Queensland Government and this project is on that track because of the Queensland Government's recommendations to the Commonwealth. There's a lot of coordination between Federal and State that's needed for this project. This Community Consultative Committee has been tasked with the role of consulting on the project as it as planned. There are always those who have alternate views and that's fair to have those.; however, it's the committee's job to consult and to ensure that the wide range of views is represented.
7	<p data-bbox="231 1014 778 1048">Conclusion and confirmation of actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ LJ confirmed the actions for the meeting as per the action list below. ▶ SC tabled a list of questions she had collated from her community. ▶ The Chair thanked the presenters and everyone for attending the meeting or listening from home and noted that the next meeting is planned for February 2021, subject to agreement with the new committee. ▶ The Chair thanked the outgoing committee for their contribution. ▶ The Chair closed the meeting.

Actions

NO.	ACTIONS	ACTION BY
1	ARTC to report back to the members regarding progress on the development of a business case regarding a dedicated freight line to the Port of Brisbane.	ARTC
2	ARTC to share the presentation with members	ARTC
3	ARTC to provide ongoing updates on the progress of environmental and technical studies	ARTC
4	ARTC to provide further information on the impact on the business case for the Gowrie to Kagaru public private partnership project with and without coal.	ARTC